arXiv:1403.5667v1 [math-ph] 22 Mar 2014

Rigorous Results for Hierarchical Models of Structural Glasses

Michele Castellana*

Abstract

We consider two non-mean-field models for structural glasses built on a hierarchical lattice. First, we consider a hierarchical version of the random energy model (HREM), and we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit of the free energy. Furthermore, we prove that the infinite-volume entropy is positive in a high-temperature region delimited by the mean-field critical temperature. This implies that the Kauzmann critical temperature—if any—cannot exceed the critical temperature obtained in the mean-field approximation: This finding extends to the HREM a result proven for a hierarchical model of a ferromagnet in F. J. Dyson., *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 12:91-107, 1969, which states that the ferromagnetic transition temperature cannot exceed its mean-field value. In addition, we show how to improve this bound by leveraging the hierarchical structure of the model. Finally, we introduce a hierarchical version of the *p*-spin model of a structural glass, and we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit and self averaging for its free energy.

1 Introduction

The random energy model (REM) [1] and the *p*-spin model (PSM) [2] are well-established mean-field models for structural glasses. Despite the fact that these models reproduce some features of the phenomenology of structural glasses [3], it is still unclear whether the REM and PSM provide a reliable description of the glass transition beyond the mean-field scenario. Given that non-mean-field versions of the REM and PSM are extremely hard to solve even with non-rigorous methods, it is natural to study the simplest solvable non-mean-field versions of these models. For ferromagnetic systems, an important role in understanding the

*Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, United States.

non-mean-field scenario has been played by spin systems built on hierarchical lattices [4]: In these models, the renormalization-group (RG) equations emerge in a simple way, and several properties of the ferromagnetic transition can be obtained rigorously [5]. To study the non-mean-field scenario of structural glasses, it is thus natural to consider hierarchical versions of the REM and PSM: The hierarchical structure of the interactions would then allow for a suitable implementation of RG methods to study these systems in the thermodynamic limit. In particular, a REM built on a hierarchical lattice—the hierarchical random energy model (HREM)—has been recently proposed and studied with perturbative and numerical methods [6].

In this paper, we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit of the free energy and we derive an upper bound for the Kauzmann critical temperature of the HREM: This upper bound extends to the HREM a result previously proven in [4] for a hierarchical model of a ferromagnet. Moreover, we show how to improve this bound by leveraging the hierarchical structure of the model. Finally, we introduce a PSM built on a hierarchical lattice (HPS), and we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit and self-averaging for its free energy.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we define the HREM, we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit for its free energy, and we derive a mean-field upper bound for the Kauzmann critical temperature. Then, we show how this upper bound can be improved by exploiting the hierarchical structure of the model. In Section 3 we introduce the HPS, and we prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit and self-averaging of the free energy. Finally, Section 4 is devoted to the discussion of the results and to an outlook on topics of future studies.

2 Hierarchical Random Energy Model

The HREM [6] is a system of 2^{k+1} Ising spins $S_i = \pm 1$ labeled by index $i = 1, 2, \cdots, 2^{k+1}$, whose Hamiltonian is given by the following

Definition 1. *The Hamiltonian of the hierarchical random energy model (HREM) is defined recursively by the equation*

$$H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] = H_k^1[\vec{S}_1] + H_k^2[\vec{S}_2] + 2^{(k+1)\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}], \tag{1}$$

where $\vec{S} \equiv \{S_i\}_{1 \le i \le 2^{k+1}}$, *and* $\vec{S}_1 \equiv \{S_i\}_{1 \le i \le 2^k}$, $\vec{S}_2 \equiv \{S_i\}_{2^k+1 \le i \le 2^{k+1}}$ *are the spins in the left and right half respectively,* $\{\varepsilon_k[\vec{S}]\}_{k,\vec{S}}$ *are IID Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance, and* σ *is a number. We assign a single-spin energy* $H_0[S] = \varepsilon_0[S]$ *to each spin,*

where $\varepsilon_0[S]$ is a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and unit variance, and the 2^{k+1} single-spin energies are all independent.

In Definition 1, the number σ determines how fast spin-spin interactions decrease with distance: The larger σ, the faster the interaction decrease [4].

Unlike the REM, the energies of the HREM are correlated random variables: Given two spin configurations $\vec{S}$, $\vec{S}'$, the energies $H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]$, $H_{k+1}[\vec{S}']$ are not independent. In recent years, Contucci *et al.* showed [7] that the thermodynamic limit of the quenched free energy of a REM with correlated energies exists under some sufficient conditions on the energy correlations. Namely, given a family $\{E_N[\vec{S}]\}_{\vec{S}\in\Sigma_N}$ of 2^N Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance with Hamiltonian $H_N[\vec{S}] \equiv -\sqrt{N}E_N[\vec{S}]$, and given a decomposition $N = N_1 + N_2$ and the projections $\pi_i(\vec{S})$ of $\vec{S} \in \Sigma_N$ into Σ_{N_i} ($i = 1,2$), the thermodynamic limit of the quenched free energy exists if

$$\mathbb{E}[H_N[\vec{S}]H_N[\vec{S}']] \leq \mathbb{E}[H_{N_1}[\pi_1(\vec{S})]H_{N_1}[\pi_1(\vec{S}')]] + \mathbb{E}[H_{N_2}[\pi_2(\vec{S})]H_{N_2}[\pi_2(\vec{S}')]] \tag{2}$$

for any $\vec{S},\vec{S}'$ and for any decomposition [7]. Unfortunately, the condition (2) does not apply to the HREM: Indeed, for $N = 2^{k+1}$, $N_1 = N_2 = 2^k$ and $\vec{S} = \vec{S}'$, from Definition 1 we have $\pi_i(\vec{S}) = \vec{S}_i$ ($i = 1,2$) and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]^2] &= \mathbb{E}[H_k^1[\vec{S}_1]^2] + \mathbb{E}[H_k^2[\vec{S}_2]^2] + 2^{(k+1)(1-\sigma)} \\ &> \mathbb{E}[H_k^1[\vec{S}_1]^2] + \mathbb{E}[H_k^2[\vec{S}_2]^2].\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we will prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit for the free energy of the HREM with a recursive method that leverages the hierarchical structure of the model. Let us introduce the partition function

$$Z_{k+1} \equiv \sum_{\vec{S}} \exp(-\beta H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]), \tag{3}$$

the free energy

$$f_{k+1} \equiv \frac{1}{2^{k+1}}\mathbb{E}\left[\log Z_{k+1}\right], \tag{4}$$

and the entropy

$$\begin{aligned}s_{k+1} &\equiv -\beta\frac{d\,f_{k+1}}{d\beta} + f_{k+1} \\ &= \beta\frac{1}{2^{k+1}}\mathbb{E}[\langle H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]\rangle] + f_{k+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\langle\rangle$ denotes the average associated with the *Boltzmannfaktor* (3), the inverse temperature β is a non-negative number and $\mathbb{E}[]$ denotes the expectation with respect to all random variables.

2.1 Thermodynamic limit of the free energy

We will first prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit for the quenched free energy with the following

Theorem 1. *If $\sigma > 0$, the infinite-volume free energy*

$$f \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} f_{k+1} \tag{6}$$

exists.

Proof. We will prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit of the free energy by using an interpolation method originally introduced for spin glasses [8, 9]: Given a number $0 \le t \le 1$, we introduce the interpolating Hamiltonian

$$H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}] \equiv H_k^1[\vec{S}_1] + H_k^2[\vec{S}_2] + \sqrt{t}\, 2^{(k+1)\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}], \tag{7}$$

and the associated partition function and free energy

$$Z_{k+1,t} \equiv \sum_{\vec{S}} \exp(-\beta H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}]), \tag{8}$$

$$\phi_{k+1,t} \equiv \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{k+1,t}]. \tag{9}$$

From Eqs. (4), (7), (8), (9) we obtain the values of $\phi_{k+1,t}$ for $t = 0, 1$

$$\phi_{k+1,1} = f_{k+1}, \tag{10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k+1,0} &= \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\log \sum_{\vec{S}} \exp[-\beta(H_k^1[\vec{S}_1] + H_k^2[\vec{S}_2])]\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\log \sum_{\vec{S}_1} \exp(-\beta H_k^1[\vec{S}_1])\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\log \sum_{\vec{S}_2} \exp(-\beta H_k^2[\vec{S}_2])\right] \right\} \\ &= f_k. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

To complete the interpolation, we compute the derivative of $\phi_{k+1,t}$ with respect to t. Given an integer $n \ge 1$ and a function $g : \Sigma_{2^{k+1}}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\langle g \rangle_t \equiv \frac{1}{Z_{k+1,t}^n} \sum_{\{\vec{S}\}} \exp\left(-\beta \sum_{a=1}^n H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}^a]\right) g(\{\vec{S}\}), \tag{12}$$

where $\{\vec{S}\} \equiv \{\vec{S}^1, \cdots, \vec{S}^n\}$. From Eqs. (7), (8), (9) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\phi_{k+1,t}}{dt} &= -\frac{\beta}{2\,2^{(k+1)\frac{1+\sigma}{2}}\sqrt{t}}\mathbb{E}[\langle \varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}]\rangle_t] \qquad (13)\\
&= \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}}\left(1-\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{Z^2_{k+1,t}}\sum_{\vec{S}^1,\vec{S}^2}\exp[-\beta(H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}^1]+H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}^2])]\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}^1=\vec{S}^2)\right]\right)\\
&= \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}}(1-\mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbb{I}(\vec{S}^1=\vec{S}^2)\rangle_t]),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third line of Eq. (13) we integrated by pars with respect to $\varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}]$, and we introduced the function $\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}^1=\vec{S}^2)$, which is equal to one if $S^1_i = S^2_i \;\; \forall i = 1, \cdots, 2^{k+1}$ and zero otherwise. From Eq. (13) we obtain

$$0 \leq \frac{d\phi_{k+1,t}}{dt} \leq \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}}. \qquad (14)$$

We now use Eq. (14) to compare f_{k+1} with f_k. Putting the identity

$$\phi_{k+1,1} = \phi_{k+1,0} + \int_0^1 \frac{d\phi_{k+1,t}}{dt}dt \qquad (15)$$

together with Eqs. (10), (11), (14), we obtain

$$f_{k+1} \geq f_k, \qquad (16)$$

and

$$f_{k+1} \leq f_k + \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}} \qquad (17)$$

To complete the proof, we use the hierarchical structure of the model by iterating the recursive inequality (17) for $k+1, k, k-1, \cdots, 0$. As we reach $k=0$, we are left with the free energy of a HREM with one spin, that we compute explicitly

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{k+1} &\leq f_k + \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}} \qquad (18)\\
&\leq f_{k-1} + \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{k\sigma}} + \frac{\beta^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}}\\
&\leq \cdots\\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\log\sum_{S=\pm 1}\exp(-\beta\varepsilon_0[S])\right] + \frac{\beta^2}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{k+1}\frac{1}{2^{l\sigma}}\\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\log\sum_{S=\pm 1}\exp(-\beta\varepsilon_0[S])\right] + \frac{\beta^2}{2}\frac{1}{2^\sigma-1}\\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fifth line of Eq. (18) we used the condition $\sigma > 0$. Equation (16) and Eq. (18) show that the sequence $k \to f_{k+1}$ is non-decreasing and bounded above respectively: Thus, $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_{k+1}$ exists. □

An important role in structural-glass models like the HREM is played by the infinite-volume entropy

$$s \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} s_{k+1}. \tag{19}$$

A long-standing question in non-mean-field structural glasses is whether there is a freezing transition characterized by a vanishing entropy at low temperatures: The critical temperature of this transition is known as the Kauzmann transition temperature [3, 10]. From a mathematical point of view, proving the existence of the thermodynamic limit for the entropy is a non-trivial problem: A well-known result in statistical mechanics known as Griffith's Lemma [11] states that, given that f_{k+1} is convex and differentiable and that f_{k+1} converges pointwise to f in an interval, then for every value of β where f is differentiable we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{d f_{k+1}}{d\beta} = \frac{d f}{d\beta}, \tag{20}$$

thus the infinite-volume entropy exists. The ensemble of points β such that f is differentiable is everywhere except a set of exceptional points. In general, showing that such set of exceptional points does not exist is not an easy task: For example, for the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model of a spin glass [12] the proof that the infinite-volume free energy is differentiable everywhere requires a detailed knowledge of the exact solution of the problem [13]. Hence, whenever we will consider the infinite-volume entropy (19) for a given β, we will explicitly assume that β is not one of the above exceptional points.

2.2 Upper bound on the Kauzmann temperature

We now establish two bounds for the Kauzmann temperature. For $\sigma > 0$, we set

$$\varphi(\beta) \equiv \mathbb{E}\left[\log \sum_{S=\pm 1} \exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1}\right)^{1/2} \varepsilon_0[S]\right]\right], \tag{21}$$

and we have the following

Theorem 2. *(Mean-field bound for the Kauzmann temperature) For $\sigma > 0$ and β such that the infinite-volume entropy s exists, we have*

$$s \geq \log 2 - \beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2\log 2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{22}$$

Hence, if there exists an inverse Kauzmann temperature β_K such that $s = 0$ for $\beta = \beta_K$, then

$$\beta_K \geq \left(\frac{2^\sigma - 1}{2^\sigma} \frac{\log 2}{2} \right)^{1/2}. \tag{23}$$

Theorem 3. *(Improvement over the mean-field bound for the Kauzmann temperature) For $\sigma > 0$ and β such that the infinite-volume entropy s exists, we have*

$$s \geq \varphi(\beta) - \beta \left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{24}$$

Hence, if there exists an inverse Kauzmann temperature β_K such that $s = 0$ for $\beta = \beta_K$, then

$$\beta_K \geq \beta_*, \tag{25}$$

where β_* is the unique solution of

$$\varphi(\beta) - \beta \left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2} = 0. \tag{26}$$

For the sake of clarity, we note that the lower bounds (23), (25) for the inverse Kauzmann critical temperature β_K are upper bounds for the Kauzmann critical temperature $T_K \equiv 1/\beta_K$.

Before proving Theorems 2, 3, we observe that the inverse critical temperature in the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (23) is proportional to the inverse critical temperature in the mean-field approximation. Indeed, the mean-field approximation of the HREM can be easily obtained by hypothesizing that the energy levels $\{H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]\}_{\vec{S}}$ are independent: In this case, the HREM reduces to a REM with a rescaled inverse critical temperature [6]

$$\beta_c = \left(\frac{2^\sigma - 1}{2^\sigma} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2}, \tag{27}$$

which is proportional to the RHS of Eq. (23) up to a constant factor independent of σ. Hence, Theorem 2 shows that—up to a constant factor—the mean-field critical temperature is an upper bound for the critical temperature of the system. In addition, in what follows we will show that bound (25) provides an improvement over bound (23).

Let us now proceed with the proofs of Theorems 2, 3. The proofs are based on a lower bound for the infinite-volume entropy, and they will be split into separate Lemmas. First, we prove the following lower bound for the entropy

Lemma 1. *Given $\sigma > 0$ and β such that the infinite-volume entropy s exists, then*

$$s \geq f - \beta \left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{28}$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[\langle H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] \rangle] \geq \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\min_{\vec{S}} H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] \Big]. \tag{29}$$

We now use a standard inequality for Gaussian random variables [14]. Consider M Gaussian random variables $\{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq M}$ with $M > 1$, $\mathbb{E}[g_i] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[g_i^2] = \tau^2 > 0$: We do not assume that $\{g_i\}$ are independent. We have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\min_i g_i \Big] > -\tau (2 \log M)^{1/2}. \tag{30}$$

We now use Eq. (30) with $\{g_i\} = \{H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]\}$, $M = 2^{2^{k+1}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^2 &= \mathbb{E}[H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]^2] \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} 2^{k+1-l} 2^{l(1-\sigma)} \\ &\leq 2^{k+1} \frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1}, \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

and we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\min_{\vec{S}} H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] \Big] \geq -\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{32}$$

Equations (5), (29), (32) show that

$$s_{k+1} \geq -\beta \left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma - 1} 2 \log 2 \right)^{1/2} + f_{k+1}. \tag{33}$$

Finally, we take the $k \to \infty$ limit of both sides of Eq. (33), we use the hypothesis that $\lim_{k \to \infty} s_{k+1}$ exists and Theorem 1, and we obtain Eq. (28). □

We now prove a lower bound for the infinite-volume free energy in Eq. (28) by using a strategy recently proposed in [15] for hierarchical models of spin glasses. With this method, the energy $\varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}]$ is reabsorbed into two random energies $e_1[\vec{S}_1]$, $e_2[\vec{S}_2]$ for the left and right-half of the spins respectively: As we will show in the following, this method improves over the inequality $f \geq \log 2$

Lemma 2. *For $\sigma > 0$, the infinite-volume free energy satisfies*

$$f \geq \varphi(\beta), \tag{34}$$

where $\varphi(\beta)$ is given by Eq. (21).

Proof. Given a number x, we set

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}] &\equiv \sqrt{t}x\,2^{(k+1)\frac{1-\sigma}{2}}\varepsilon_{k+1}[\vec{S}] + \sqrt{1-t}\,\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}2^{(k+1)\frac{1-\sigma}{2}}(e_1[\vec{S}_1]+e_2[\vec{S}_2]) + \\ &\quad + H_k^1[\vec{S}_1] + H_k^2[\vec{S}_2], \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

$$Z_{k+1,t} \equiv \sum_{\vec{S}} \exp(-\beta H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}]), \tag{36}$$

$$\phi_{k+1,t}(x) \equiv \frac{1}{2^{k+1}}\mathbb{E}[\log Z_{k+1,t}], \tag{37}$$

where $\{e_1[\vec{S}_1]\}_{\vec{S}_1}$, $\{e_2[\vec{S}_2]\}_{\vec{S}_2}$ are IID Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance that are independent of all other random variables. Let us now proceed with the interpolation: From Eqs. (4), (35), (36), (37) we have

$$\phi_{k+1,1}(1) = f_{k+1}, \tag{38}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k+1,0}(x) &= \frac{1}{2^k}\mathbb{E}\left[\log\sum_{\vec{S}}\exp\left\{-\beta\left[H_{k-1}^1[\vec{S}_1]+H_{k-1}^2[\vec{S}_2]+\left(1+\frac{x^2}{2^\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-\sigma}{2}}\varepsilon_k[\vec{S}]\right]\right\}\right] \\ &= \phi_{k,1}\left(\left(1+\frac{x^2}{2^\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

The derivative of $\phi_{k+1,t}(x)$ with respect to t reads

$$\frac{d\phi_{k+1,t}(x)}{dt} = \frac{\beta^2 x^2}{2\,2^{(k+1)\sigma}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}_1^1=\vec{S}_1^2)+\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}_2^1=\vec{S}_2^2)\right]-\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}^1=\vec{S}^2)\right\rangle_t\right], \tag{40}$$

where $\vec{S}^a = \{S_1^a,\cdots,S_{2^{k+1}}^a\}$ denotes the spin configuration of replica a, with $a=1,2$, $\vec{S}_1^a = \{S_1^a,\cdots,S_{2^k}^a\}$, $\vec{S}_2^a = \{S_{2^k+1}^a,\cdots,S_{2^{k+1}}^a\}$ are the projections onto the left and right half respectively, and $\langle\rangle_t$ is given by Eq. (12). Equation (40) and the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}_1^1=\vec{S}_1^2)+\mathbb{I}(\vec{S}_2^1=\vec{S}_2^2)\right] \geq \mathbb{I}(\vec{S}^1=\vec{S}^2) \tag{41}$$

imply

$$\frac{d\phi_{k+1,t}(x)}{dt} \geq 0. \tag{42}$$

Equations (39), (42) give

$$\phi_{k+1,1}(x) \geq \phi_{k,1}\left(\left(1+\frac{x^2}{2^\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \tag{43}$$

We now use Eq. (43) recursively

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k+1} &\geq \phi_{k,1}\left(\left(1+\frac{1}{2^\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\geq \phi_{k-1,1}\left(\left(1+\frac{1}{2^\sigma}+\frac{1}{2^{2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\geq \cdots \\ &\geq \phi_{1,0}\left(\left(1+\sum_{l=1}^{k}\frac{1}{2^{l\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\log\sum_{S=\pm 1}\exp\left[-\beta\left(1+\sum_{l=1}^{k+1}\frac{1}{2^{l\sigma}}\right)^{1/2}\varepsilon_0[S]\right]\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Equation (34) follows by taking the $k\to\infty$ limit of both sides of Eq. (44) and using Theorem 1 and Eq. (21). □

To obtain a bound on the Kauzmann temperature, we now establish two properties of the lower bound for the entropy obtained in Lemma 2

Lemma 3. *For $\sigma > 0$, we have*

$$\frac{d}{d\beta}\left[\varphi(\beta)-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}2\log 2\right)^{1/2}\right] \leq 0. \tag{45}$$

and Eq. (26) has a unique solution, that we will denote by β_*.

Proof. Equation (45) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\varphi(\beta)}{d\beta} &= -\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\mathbb{E}[\langle\varepsilon_0[S]\rangle_0] \\ &\leq -\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\left[\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}2\log 2\right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where $\langle\rangle_0$ denotes the average associated with the *Boltzmannfaktor*

$$\zeta \equiv \sum_{S=\pm 1} \exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\varepsilon_0[S]\right], \tag{47}$$

and in the last line of Eq. (46) we used Eq. (30). We now prove that there is a unique solution to Eq. (26): First, from Eq. (21) we have

$$\varphi(0) = \log 2. \tag{48}$$

Second, we consider $\beta > 0$ and we have

$$\exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\right] \le \zeta \le 2\exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\right]. \tag{49}$$

We now take the logarithm of both sides of Eq. (49), we divide by β and we take the expectation: By using Eqs. (21), (47) we obtain

$$-\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\Big] \le \frac{\varphi(\beta)}{\beta} \le -\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\Big] + \frac{\log 2}{\beta}. \tag{50}$$

Equation (50) shows that $\lim_{\beta\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(\beta)}{\beta}$ exists, and that it is given by

$$\lim_{\beta\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(\beta)}{\beta} = -\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\min_S \varepsilon_0[S]\Big]. \tag{51}$$

We now estimate the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (51) with Eq. (30): We obtain

$$\lim_{\beta\to\infty}\frac{1}{\beta}\left[\varphi(\beta) - \beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}2\log 2\right)^{1/2}\right] < 0. \tag{52}$$

Equations (48), (52) show that there exists at least one solution to Eq. (26), and Eq. (45) proves that the solution is unique. □

We can now prove Theorems 2, 3

Proof of Theorem 2. From Eq. (21) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\beta) &= \log 2 + \mathbb{E}\left[\log\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{S=\pm 1}\exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\varepsilon_0[S]\right]\right\}\right] \\
&\ge \log 2 + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{S=\pm 1}\log\exp\left[-\beta\left(\frac{2^\sigma}{2^\sigma-1}\right)^{1/2}\varepsilon_0[S]\right]\right] \\
&= \log 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where in the second line of Eq. (53) we used the concavity of the log, and in the third line we used $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_0[S]] = 0$. Equation (22) is then obtained from Lemmas 1, 2 and Eq. (53). Finally, Eq. (23) follows from Eq. (22). □

Proof of Theorem 3. Equation (24) follows from Lemmas 1, 2. Equation (25) follows from Lemma 3. □

It is easy to show that bound (25) for the Kauzmann temperature improves over the mean-field bound (23). Indeed, for a given $\sigma > 0$ and β, a strict inequality holds [16] in the second line of Eq. (53)

$$\varphi(\beta) > \log 2, \tag{54}$$

and the RHS of inequality (25) is strictly larger than the RHS of inequality (23)

$$\beta_* > \left(\frac{2^\sigma - 1}{2^\sigma} \frac{\log 2}{2} \right)^{1/2}. \tag{55}$$

For $\sigma \to 0$, both the RHS of Eqs. (22) and (25) tend to zero: This is in agreement with the physical expectation that the critical temperature should diverge in this limit because the Hamiltonian is superextensive.

3 Hierarchical p-spin Model

We now introduce the HPS: Given an integer $p \geq 2$, the HPS is a system of p^{k+1} Ising spins $S_i = \pm 1$ labeled by index $i = 1, 2, \cdots, p^{k+1}$, whose Hamiltonian is given by the following

Definition 2. *The Hamiltonian of the hierarchical p-spin model (HPS) is defined recursively by the equation*

$$H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] = \sum_{r=1}^{p} H_k^r[\vec{S}_r] - \frac{\sqrt{p!}}{p^{(k+1)(p-2(1-\sigma))/2}} \sum_{i_1 > \cdots > i_p = 1}^{p^{k+1}} J_{i_1 \cdots i_p} S_{i_1} \cdots S_{i_p}, \tag{56}$$

where $\vec{S} \equiv \{S_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq p^{k+1}}$, and $\vec{S}_r \equiv \{S_i\}_{1+p^k(r-1) \leq i \leq p^k r}$ are the spins in the r-th hierarchical block, $H_0[S_i] \equiv h_i S_i$, $\{J_{i_1 \cdots i_p}\}_{p^{k+1} \geq i_1 > \cdots > i_p \geq 1}$ are IID Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance, $\{h_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq p^{k+1}}$ are IID Gaussian random variables, and σ is a number.

The structure of spin interactions in the HPS is depicted in Fig. 1. Like for the HREM, the number σ in Definition 2 determines how fast spin-spin interactions decrease with distance: The larger σ, the faster the interaction decrease.



Figure 1: Hierarchical p-spin model with $p = 3$, $k = 1$ and vanishing external magnetic field h_i. Each dot represents a spin. The lower arcs represent three-spin interactions between spins below them. The upper arcs represent three-spin interactions between the spins interacting through the lower arcs.

Let us introduce the partition function

$$Z_{k+1} \equiv \sum_{\vec{S}} \exp(-\beta H_{k+1}[\vec{S}]), \tag{57}$$

and the free energy

$$f_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\log Z_{k+1}\right], \tag{58}$$

where the inverse temperature β is a non-negative number and $\mathbb{E}[]$ denotes the expectation with respect to all random variables: We prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit of f_{k+1} with the following

Theorem 4. *If $\sigma > 1/2$, the infinite-volume free energy*

$$f \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} f_{k+1} \tag{59}$$

exists.

Proof. Given $0 \le t \le 1$, we introduce the interpolating Hamiltonian and the associated partition function and free energy

$$H_{k+1,t}[\vec{S}] \equiv -\sqrt{t}\frac{\sqrt{p!}}{p^{(k+1)(p-2(1-\sigma))/2}} \sum_{i_1>\cdots>i_p=1}^{p^{k+1}} J_{i_1\cdots i_p} S_{i_1}\cdots S_{i_p} + \sum_{r=1}^{p} H_k^r[\vec{S}_r]. \tag{60}$$

Following the method used in Theorem 1, it is easy to show that Eq. (60) implies

$$f_{k+1} \ge f_k. \tag{61}$$

Equation (61) shows that the sequence $k \to f_{k+1}$ is non-decreasing. In order to show that $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_{k+1}$ exists, we need to prove that the sequence is also bounded above: Instead of proving this by establishing an upper bound on $d\phi_{k+1,t}/dt$ like in Theorem 1, here we will use a different method. Let us denote by $\mathbb{E}_J[]$ the average over the random variables at the $k+1$-th hierarchical level $\{J_{i_1\cdots i_p}\}_{p^{k+1}\geq i_1>\cdots>i_p\geq 1}$ in Definition 2. From Eq. (58) we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{p^{k+1}}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_J[\log Z_{k+1}]] \qquad (62)\\ &\leq \frac{1}{p^{k+1}}\mathbb{E}[\log[\mathbb{E}_J[Z_{k+1}]] \\ &= f_k + \frac{\beta^2 p^{k+1}(p^{k+1}-1)\cdots(p^{k+1}-(p-1))}{2\,p^{(k+1)(2\sigma-1+p)}} \\ &\leq f_k + \frac{\beta^2}{2}p^{(k+1)(1-2\sigma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line of Eq. (62) we used Jensen's inequality, and in the third line we computed the Gaussian integral over $\{J_{i_1\cdots i_p}\}_{p^{k+1}\geq i_1>\cdots>i_p\geq 1}$. We now iterate Eq. (62) for $k+1, k, k-1, \cdots, 0$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k+1} &\leq \mathbb{E}[\log(2\cosh(\beta h))] + \frac{\beta^2}{2}\frac{1}{p^{2\sigma-1}-1} \qquad (63)\\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line of Eq. (63) we used the condition $\sigma > 1/2$. Equations (61), (63) show that the sequence $k \to f_{k+1}$ is non-decreasing and bounded above, thus $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_{k+1}$ exists. □

It is straightforward to prove that the free energy of the HPS is self-averaging

Theorem 5. *If $\sigma > 1/2$, then*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{p^{k+1}}\log Z_{k+1} = f \quad \textit{with probability } 1. \qquad (64)$$

Proof. Given a set $i_1 > \cdots > i_p$ of p spins, we denote by $\kappa_{i_1\cdots i_p} = 1, \cdots, k+1$ the lowest hierarchical level of interactions $J_{i_1\cdots i_p}$ connecting spins $S_{i_1}, \cdots, S_{i_p}$, and we set

$$\gamma^2_{i_1\cdots i_p} \equiv \sum_{l=\kappa_{i_1\cdots i_p}}^{k+1} \frac{1}{p^{l(p-2(1-\sigma))}}. \qquad (65)$$

The quantity $\gamma^2_{i_1\cdots i_p}$ is proportional to the variance of the random coupling that connects spins $S_{i_1},\cdots,S_{i_p}$: This coupling results from a sum of interactions over multiple hierarchical levels. We now set $\chi^2 \equiv \mathbb{E}[h^2]$ and we write Eq. (56) as

$$H_{k+1}[\vec{S}] = -\sqrt{p!}\sum_{i_1>\cdots>i_p}^{p^{k+1}} \gamma_{i_1\cdots i_p} g_{i_1\cdots i_p} S_{i_1}\cdots S_{i_p} + \chi \sum_{i=1}^{p^{k+1}} g_i S_i, \tag{66}$$

where $\{g_{i_1\cdots i_p}\}_{p^{k+1}\geq i_1>\cdots>i_p\geq 1}$, $\{g_i\}_{1\leq i\leq p^{k+1}}$ are IID Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance. We have [11]

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{p^{k+1}}\log Z_{k+1} - f_{k+1}\right| \geq \frac{1}{p^{(k+1)/4}}\right) \leq 2\exp\left[-\frac{p^{3(k+1)/2}}{4A^2}\right], \tag{67}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A^2 &\equiv \beta^2 p! \sum_{i_1>\cdots>i_p} \gamma^2_{i_1\cdots i_p} + \beta^2\chi^2 p^{k+1} \qquad (68)\\ &= \beta^2\left[\sum_{l=1}^{k+1} p^{k+1-l}\frac{1}{p^{l(p-2(1-\sigma))}} p^l(p^l-1)\cdots(p^l-(p-1)) + \chi^2 p^{k+1}\right] \\ &\leq \beta^2 p^{k+1}\left(\frac{1}{p^{2\sigma-1}-1}+\chi^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line of Eq. (68) we wrote the sum over $i_1>\cdots>i_p$ as a sum over the hierarchical levels, and in the third line we used the condition $\sigma > 1/2$. By plugging Eq. (68) in Eq. (67) and using Borel-Cantelli Lemma we have that

$$\left|\frac{1}{p^{k+1}}\log Z_{k+1} - f_{k+1}\right| \geq \frac{1}{p^{(k+1)/4}} \tag{69}$$

only for finitely many k, which proves Eq. (64). □

4 Conclusions and Outlook

In this paper we studied two non-mean field models for structural glasses built on a hierarchical lattice. We first considered a hierarchical version of the random energy model (HREM): The HREM was previously introduced and studied in [6] by means of perturbative and numerical methods. For the HREM, we proved the existence of the thermodynamic limit of the free energy. Then, we focused on the possibility that the HREM undergoes a freezing transition

characterized by a vanishing entropy at low temperatures. We show that the infinite-volume entropy is positive in a high-temperature region delimited by the mean-field critical temperature: This implies that if there is a freezing transition, then its critical temperature—known as the Kauzmann temperature [10]—must satisfy a mean-field upper bound. This bound extends to the HREM a result previously derived in [4] for a hierarchical model of a ferromagnet. In addition, by using a method recently proposed in [15], we improved over the above mean-field bound by exploiting the hierarchical structure of the model. Finally, we introduced a p-spin model built on a hierarchical lattice, and we proved the existence of the thermodynamic limit and self-averaging for its free energy.

As a topic of future research, it would be interesting to study the existence of a finite-temperature Kauzmann transition in the HREM. Indeed, studying the existence of a Kauzmann transition in non-mean-field models of structural glasses is an interesting physical question that has been raising interest for several decades now [3]. Together with the upper bound on the Kauzmann temperature proven in this paper, a lower bound for the transition temperature would provide a rigorous proof of the existence of a Kauzmann transition in these models.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank A. Barra and F. Guerra for useful discussions. Research supported by NSF Grants PHY–0957573, by the Human Frontiers Science Program, by the Swartz Foundation, and by the W. M. Keck Foundation.

References

[1] B. Derrida. Random-energy model: Limit of a family of disordered models. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 45(2):79–82, 1980.

[2] D. J. Gross and M. Mézard. The simplest spin glass. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 240(4):431–452, 1984.

[3] G. Biroli and J. P. Bouchaud. The random first-order transition theory of glasses: a critical assessment. arXiv:0912.2542, 2009.

[4] F. J. Dyson. Existence of a phase transition in a one-dimensional Ising ferromagnet. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 12(2):91–107, 1969.

[5] P. M. Bleher and J. G. Sinai. Investigation of the critical point in models of the type of Dyson's hierarchical models. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 33(1):23–42, 1973.

[6] M. Castellana, A. Decelle, S. Franz, M. Mézard, and G. Parisi. Hierarchical random energy model of a spin glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 104(12):127206, 2010.

[7] P. Contucci, M. Degli Esposti, C. Giardinà, and S. Graffi. Thermodynamical limit for correlated gaussian random energy models. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 236(1):55–63, 2003.

[8] F. Guerra and F. L. Toninelli. The thermodynamic limit in mean field spin glass models. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 230(1):71–79, 2002.

[9] F. Guerra. Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 233(1):1–12, 2003.

[10] W. Kauzmann. The nature of the glassy state and the behavior of liquids at low temperatures. *Chem. Rev.*, 43(2):219–256, 1948.

[11] M. Talagrand. *Mean field models for spin glasses*, volume I. Springer, 2011.

[12] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick. Solvable model of a spin-glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett*, 35 (26):1792–1796, 1975.

[13] D. Panchenko. On differentiability of the Parisi formula. *Elect. Comm. in Probab.*, 13: 241–247, 2008.

[14] M. Talagrand. *Mean field models for spin glasses*, volume II. Springer, 2011.

[15] M. Castellana, A. Barra, and F. Guerra. Free-energy bounds for hierarchical spin models. To appear on J. Stat. Phys, online at arXiv:1312.2528.

[16] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Polya. Inequalities. *Cambridge University Press*, 1952.